



05-13-03



RCE/1600

27123

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

↑ AFFIX CUSTOMER NUMBER LABEL ABOVE ↑

**REQUEST
FOR
CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE)
TRANSMITTAL**

Subsection (b) of 35 U.S.C. §132, effective on May 29, 2000,
provides for continued examination of an utility or plant application
filed on or after June 8, 1995.
See The American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA)

Application No.	09/303,510
Filing Date	April 30, 1999
First Named Inventor	Collisson, et al.
Group Art Unit	1648
Examiner Name	Ulrike Winkler
Atty Docket No.	2976-4054

MAY 15 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

This is a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 of the above-identified application.

NOTE: 37 C.F.R. §1.114 is effective on May 29, 2000. If the above-identified application was filed prior to May 29, 2000, applicant may wish to consider filing a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 C.F.R. §1.53(d) (PTO/SB/29) instead of a RCE to be eligible for the patent term adjustment provisions of the AIPA. See Changes to Application Examination and Provisional Application Practice, Interim Rule, 65 Fed. Reg. 14865 (Mar. 20, 2000), 1233 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 47 (Apr. 11, 2000), which established RCE practice.

1. **Submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114**

- a. ☐ Previously submitted
- i. ☐ Consider the amendment(s)/reply under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 previously filed on _____.
(Any unentered amendment(s) referred to above will be entered).
- ii. ☐ Consider the arguments in the Appeal Brief or Reply Brief previously filed on ____.
- iii. ☐ Other:
- b. ☒ Enclosed
- i. ☐ Amendment/Reply
- ii. ☐ Affidavit(s)/Declaration(s)
- iii. ☐ Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)
- iv. ☒ Other: Transmittal of Related Pending Applications 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(2)(iii);
Related Case Submission including Publication No. US 2002/0051792 A1

Match and Return

2. **Miscellaneous**

- a. ☐ Suspension of action on the above-identified application is requested under 37 C.F.R. §1.103(c) for a period of ____ months. (Period of suspension shall not exceed 3 months; Fee under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(i) required)
- b. Other:

3. **Fees**

The RCE fee under C.F.R. §1.17(e) is required by 37 C.F.R. §1.114 when the RCE is filed

- a. ☐ The Director is hereby authorized to charge the following fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. _____. 05/14/2003 MAHMED1 00000095 09303510
- i. ☒ RCE fee required under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) 01 FC:1801 750.00 DP
- ii. ☐ Extension of time fee (37 C.F.R. §§1.136 and 1.17)
- iii. ☐ Other
- b. ☒ Check in the amount of \$750.00 enclosed.
- c. ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500 Order No. 2976-4054.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT REQUIRED

Name (Print/Type)	Dorothy R. Auth	Reg. No. (Atty/Agent)	36,434
Signature	Dorothy R. Auth	Date	May 12, 2003



Docket No. 2976-4054

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Ellen W. Collisson, et al.

Group Art Unit: 1648

Serial No.: 09/303,510

Examiner: Winkler, Ulrike

Filed: April 30, 1999

For: NUCLEIC ACID ENCODING FELINE CD86

EXPRESS MAIL CERTIFICATE

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Express Mail Label No.: EV 245489346 US

Date of Deposit: May 12, 2003

I hereby certify that the following attached paper(s) and/or fee

1. Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal (1 page);
2. Check in the amount of \$750.00 to cover filing fee;
3. Transmittal of Related Pending Application 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)2(iii) (1 page);
4. Related Case Submission (1 page) including Publication No. US 2002/0051792 A1;
5. Revocation of Power of Attorney Under 37 C.F.R. §1.36 and Power of Attorney (2 pages) including copy of executed Assignment (3 pages); and
6. Return receipt postcard.

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Jafet N. Cotto

(Typed or printed name of person mailing papers(s)
and/or fee)

(Signature of person mailing paper(s) and/or fee)

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile

The transitional phrase “consisting essentially of” limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps “and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristic(s)” of the claimed invention. *In re Herz*, 537 F.2d 549, 551-52, 190 USPQ 461, 463 (CCPA 1976) (emphasis in original) (Prior art hydraulic fluid required a dispersant which appellants argued was excluded from claims limited to a functional fluid “consisting essentially of” certain components. In finding the claims did not exclude the prior art dispersant, the court noted that appellants’ specification indicated the claimed composition can contain any well-known additive such as a dispersant, and there was no evidence that the presence of a dispersant would materially affect the basic and novel characteristic of the claimed invention. The prior art composition had the same basic and novel characteristic (increased oxidation resistance) as well as additional enhanced detergent and dispersant characteristics.). “A consisting essentially of claim occupies a middle ground between closed claims that are written in a consisting of format and fully open claims that are drafted in a comprising’ format.” *PPG Industries v. Guardian Industries*, 156 F.3d 1351, 1354, 48 USPQ2d 1351, 1353-54 (Fed. Cir. 1998). See also *Atlas Powder v. E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 224 USPQ 409 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *In re Janakirama-Rao*, 317 F.2d 951, 137 USPQ 893 (CCPA 1963); *Water Technologies Corp. vs. Calco, Ltd.*, 850 F.2d 660, 7 USPQ2d 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1988). For the purposes of searching for and applying prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, “consisting essentially of” will be construed as equivalent to “comprising.” See, e.g., *PPG*, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355 (“PPG could have defined the scope of the phrase consisting essentially of for purposes of its patent by making clear in its specification what it regarded as constituting a material change in the basic and novel characteristics of the invention.”). See also *In re Janakirama-Rao*, 317 F.2d 951, 954, 137 USPQ 893, 895-96 (CCPA 1963). If an applicant contends that additional steps or materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of “consisting essentially of,” applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional steps or components would materially change the characteristics of applicant’s invention. *In re De Lajarte*, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964). See also *Ex parte Hoffman*, 12 USPQ2d 1061, 1063-64 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989) (“Although consisting essentially of is typically used and defined in the context of compositions of matter, we find nothing intrinsically wrong with the use of such language as a modifier of method steps. . . [rendering] the claim open only for the inclusion of steps which do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed method. To determine the steps included versus excluded the claim must be read in light of the specification. . . . [I]t is an applicant’s burden to establish that a step practiced in a prior art method is excluded from his claims by consisting essentially of language.”).